

Law Offices of  
**Bennet & Bennet, PLLC**  
1019 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

*Caressa D. Bennet*  
*Michael R. Bennet*  
*Marjorie G. Spivak*  
*Gregory W. Whiteaker*  
*Edward D. Kania*  
*Donald L. Herman, Jr.\**

Tel: (202) 530-9800  
Fax: (202) 530-9805

e-mail: [mail@bennetlaw.com](mailto:mail@bennetlaw.com)  
<http://www.bennetlaw.com>

Of Counsel  
*Philip E. Bennet\*\**

Telecommunications Analyst  
*Ken C. Johnson*

\*Admitted in Alabama Only

\*\*Admitted in New York Only

**RECEIVED**

**FEB - 9 1999**

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

February 9, 1999

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
The Portals  
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership; Request for Waiver of Section  
20.18(e) of the Commission's Rules; CC Docket No. 94-102**

Dear Ms. Salas:

On behalf of New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership ("Licensee") and pursuant to §1.3 of the Federal Communications Commission's ("Commission") rules and the invitation of the Commission's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau in its December 24, 1998 Public Notice (DA 98-2631) entitled "Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Outlines Guideline for Wireless E911 Rule Waivers for Handset-Based Approaches to Phase II Automatic Location Identification Requirements", we hereby submit the original signature page for Licensee's Request for Waiver of Section 20.18(e) of the Commission's rules. The original signature page was not available for filing on February 4, 1999. We have attached a date-stamped copy of the submission which bears a facsimile signature as proof of timely filing.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please communicate directly with the undersigned.

Sincerely,

*Michael R. Bennet*

Michael R. Bennet

No. of Copies  
List ABCDE

0 + 5

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554

**DATE STAMP  
AND RETURN**

In the Matter of )

Revision of the Commission's Rules )  
To Ensure Compatibility with )  
Enhanced 911 Emergency )  
Calling Systems )

CC Docket No. 94-102

**RECEIVED**

FEB - 4 1999

To: Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership, Request for Waiver  
of Section 20.18(e) of the Commission's Rules**

New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership ("Licensee"), pursuant to § 1.3 of the Rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC" or "Commission")<sup>1</sup> and the invitation of the Commission's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau in its December 24, 1998 Public Notice (DA 98-2631) captioned "Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Outlines Guidelines for Wireless E911 Rule Waivers for Handset-Based Approaches to Phase II Automatic Location Identification Requirements", hereby requests a waiver of Section 20.18(e) of the Commission's Rules regarding Phase II enhanced 911 ("E911") services.

Licensee is a small, rural cellular carrier operating in the New Mexico RSA 6. Section 20.18(e) of the Commission's Rules requires that, by October 1, 2001, cellular licensees provide to the designated Public Safety Answering Point ("PSAP") the location of all 911 calls by longitude and latitude such that the accuracy for all calls is 125 meters or less using a Root Mean Square methodology (hereinafter referred to as the Automatic Location Identification or "ALI" requirement). The ALI requirement is applicable, however, only if (1) the administrator of the designated PSAP has requested ALI services and is capable of receiving and utilizing the data elements associated with the service, and (2) a mechanism for recovering the costs of the service is in place. 47 C.F.R. §20.18(f). Absent a waiver, or the nonoccurrence of either of the two aforementioned conditions, Licensee will be required to meet the requirements of Section 20.18(e). Because Licensee is uncertain at this point in time as to whether it will be capable of meeting those requirements, it is requesting herein that the Commission waive Section 20.18(e) with respect to Licensee.

Licensee commends the Bureau for issuing its Public Notice regarding Phase II implementation. The Public Notice serves as a useful reminder to the wireless industry of the

---

<sup>1</sup>47 C.F.R. § 1.3 (1996).

need to focus now on the steps needed to satisfy a distant implementation date. Unfortunately, because the October, 2001 implementation date is almost three years away, it is difficult for Licensee to know with certainty at this time whether it will be able to meet that deadline. However, for the reasons discussed below, Licensee doubts its ability to meet this deadline. Accordingly, it is requesting a waiver at this time.

Licensee's service area is sparsely populated (1.5 customers per square mile) and the cost of installing sufficient infrastructure to provide Phase II ALI to each of Licensee's customers would be exorbitant. Specifically, the cost of constructing additional cell sites to allow for triangulation capable of meeting the Commission's ALI requirement would be approximately \$6,000,000.00. Additional cell sites would be required both in portions of Licensee's service area where towers are presently located too far apart to facilitate effective triangulation and along service area borders where directional antennas must be used in order to avoid interfering with cellular systems serving adjacent service areas.

The cost per subscriber of Licensee constructing the additional cell sites necessary to comply with the Commission's rule will be approximately \$635. Because New Mexico has yet to adopt a cost recovery mechanism, and therefore this cost at present cannot be recovered, it must by necessity be passed onto Licensee's subscribers in the form of higher rates. Such a rate increase is significant, and will result in many subscribers dropping their wireless service. Ironically, if existing and potential consumers of Licensee's wireless services deem such services too costly as a result of a Commission mandate to deliver ALI by October 1, 2001, and therefore elect not to utilize such services, much of the anticipated public interest benefit of expanded E911 capability may be lost. Simply put, the public interest costs (in terms of public safety) of requiring Licensee to make the investments necessary to meet the Commission's stated deadline outweigh the public interest benefits of the increased accuracy of E911 available to those subscribers still able to afford wireless service.

Licensee supports the FCC's efforts to facilitate the provision of enhanced 911 services to all Americans, and is fully committed to bringing the benefits of E911 to its subscribers.<sup>2</sup> However, the E911 characteristics that are important to Licensee's rural residents differ significantly from those desired by residents residing in urban, suburban and less rural areas served by other carriers. For example, ALI accuracy of the degree required by Section 20.18(e) may be critical to locating a 911 caller in a dense urban environment. For a caller in a service area such as Licensee's, however, where the caller may be the only subscriber within a one mile area and there may be only one road traversing that area, such a high level of accuracy is simply unnecessary. It would be like using a telescope to locate the Washington Monument; it is simply unnecessary.

---

<sup>2</sup> As a cooperative owned entity whose members *are* its subscribers, Licensee is particularly cognizant of the importance of E911 to its subscribers.

Where subscribers are located within a reasonably close proximity to each other, Licensee has cell sites within sufficiently close proximity to triangulate. Accordingly, Licensee may be able to meet the October 1, 2001 Phase II ALI deadline with respect to the most populated portion of its service area. It is only with respect to the remote unpopulated or sparsely populated portions of Licensee's service area that meeting the October 1, 2001 deadline may not be possible. Moreover, even without advanced ALI technology, Licensee should be able to locate a 911 caller anywhere in its service area more quickly than a Phase II compliant urban carrier will be able to locate a high rise dwelling 911 caller.

In sum, requiring Licensee to meet the October, 2001 deadline for ALI compliance is impractical, unnecessary and will not serve the public interest. Imposing on Licensee the costs of compliance with a requirement that is simply unnecessary in sparsely populated rural environments will not serve the Commission's stated goal of improving public safety. Ironically, to the contrary, imposing such requirements on Licensee is simply likely to drive customers away from Licensee's cellular service, thereby denying them the very public safety benefits that attract many consumers to take wireless service in the first place.

For the foregoing reasons, Licensee submits that the requested waiver is in the public interest.

Respectfully submitted.

**New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership**

By JS /  
John Smith  
General Manager

February 4, 1999

U:\Docs2\Clients\Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative\ALIwaiver9.129mb.wpd

Where subscribers are located within a reasonably close proximity to each other, Licensee has cell sites within sufficiently close proximity to triangulate. Accordingly, Licensee may be able to meet the October 1, 2001 Phase II ALI deadline with respect to the most populated portion of its service area. It is only with respect to the remote unpopulated or sparsely populated portions of Licensee's service area that meeting the October 1, 2001 deadline may not be possible. Moreover, even without advanced ALI technology, Licensee should be able to locate a 911 caller anywhere in its service area more quickly than a Phase II compliant urban carrier will be able to locate a high rise dwelling 911 caller.


In sum, requiring Licensee to meet the October, 2001 deadline for ALI compliance is impractical, unnecessary and will not serve the public interest. Imposing on Licensee the costs of compliance with a requirement that is simply unnecessary in sparsely populated rural environments will not serve the Commission's stated goal of improving public safety. Ironically, to the contrary, imposing such requirements on Licensee is simply likely to drive customers away from Licensee's cellular service, thereby denying them the very public safety benefits that attract many consumers to take wireless service in the first place.

For the foregoing reasons, Licensee submits that the requested waiver is in the public interest.

Respectfully submitted,

New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership

By

  
John Smith  
General Manager

February 4, 1999

Direct Office/Licensee Rural Telephone Cooperative/ALI waiver 9/29/99 up

Law Offices of  
***Bennet & Bennet, PLLC***  
1019 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

*Curessa D. Bennet*  
*Michael R. Bennet*  
*Marjorie G. Spivak*  
*Gregory W. Whiteaker*  
*Edward D. Kania*  
*Donald L. Herman, Jr. \**

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Tel: (202) 530-9800*  
*Fax: (202) 530-9805*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*e-mail: mail@bennetlaw.com*  
*http://www.bennetlaw.com*

Of Counsel  
*Philip E. Bennet\*\**

Telecommunications Analyst  
*Ken C. Johnson*

*\*Admitted in Alabama Only*

*\*\*Admitted in New York Only*

February 4, 1999

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
The Portals  
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership; Request for Waiver of Section  
20.18(e) of the Commission's Rules; CC Docket No. 94-102**

Dear Ms. Salas:

Transmitted herewith, on behalf of New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership, and pursuant to §1.3 of the Federal Communications Commission's ("Commission") rules and the invitation of the Commission's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau in its December 24, 1998 Public Notice (DA 98-2631) entitled "Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Outlines Guideline for Wireless E911 Rule Waivers for Handset-Based Approaches to Phase II Automatic Location Identification Requirements", are an original and five copies of New Mexico RSA 6-III Partnership's Request for Waiver of Section 20.18(e) of the Commission's rules. The request contains a facsimile signature which is slightly illegible. We have attached a clear copy of an unsigned signature page to reflect the contents of page 3 of the petition. The original signature will be filed with the Commission as soon as it is available.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please communicate directly with the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Michael R. Bennet